FILED
OCT 29 2010

No. 09-1579

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

October Term 2010

Napoleon Spear,

Petitioner,

v.

General Motors Corporation a/k/a
General Motors Company

Respondent.

Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Court of Appeals of Maryland

PETITION FOR REHEARING

NAPOLEON SPEAR, Petitioner
1419 Kennesaw Drive, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30318
(404) 875-4877

Counsel for Petitioner

T. WARE PRINTING GROUP / Atlanta, Georgia 30315 / 404-945-0342

QUESTION PRESENTED

This petition raises important issues concerning the following Federal question to wit:

1. May a State Supreme Court or a State Court of Appeals affirm a lower State trial Court on any ground not stated in the lower trial Court's final order or on any other grounds not appealed by the parties, where an appellant had no reasonable opportunity to appeal or address such ground in the State's lower trial Courts or the State Appellate Courts in clear violation of an appellant rights to due process under both the 5th, and 14th, amendments to the United States Constitution?

LIST OF THE PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Napoleon Spear is the petitioner in this case and he is proceeding in this matter pro se as a matter of right. Petitioner is a disabled employee of the Respondent. The Respondent in this matter is General Motors Company f/k/a General Motors Corporation and both of the parties named herein this Petition for Rehearing are subject to the Supreme Court's jurisdiction as a matter of law.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

United States Supreme Court Decisions

Betts v. *Brady*,
316 U.S. 455, 62 S.Ct. 1252 (1954) 4

Bolling v. *Sharpe*,
347 U.S. 497, 500, 74 S.Ct. 693, (1954) 5

Bouie v. *City of Columbia*,
378 U.S. 347, 84 S. Ct. 1697(1964) 13

Buckley v. *Valeo*,
424 U.S. 1 (1976) 5

Califano v. *Webster*,
430 U.S. 313 (1977) 6

Craig v. *Boren*,
429 U.S. 190, 197 (1976) 6

Hampton v. *Mow Sun Wong*,
426 U.S. 88, 100, 96 S.Ct. 1895 (1976) 5

Logan v. *Zimmerman Brush Co*.,
455 U.S. 422, 102 S.Ct. 1148(1982) 8, 10

Mapp v. *Ohio*,
367 U.S. 643, 654-55 (1961) 6

Malinski v. *New York*,
324 U.S. 401, 415 (1945) 13

Memphis Light, Gas & Water Div. v. *Craft*,

436 U.S. 1, 13 (1978) 9

Planned Parenthood v. *Casey*,

505 U.S. 833, 112 S.Ct. 2791(1992) 8

Parratt v. *Taylor*,

451 U.S. 527, 101 S.Ct. 1908 (1981) 8, 9

Truax v. *Corrigan* 257 U.S. 317 (1921) 4

Weinberger v. *Wiesenfeld*,

420 U.S. 636 (1975) 5

Vance v. *Bradley*,

440 U.S. 93, (1979) 5

Constitutional and Federal Statutes:

Amendment V and XIV 2, 9, 12

28 U.S.C. § 1257(a) 6, 9, 10

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTION PRESENTED	ii
LIST OF PARTIES	iii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iv
PETITION FOR REHEARING	vii
I. BACKGROUND	1
II. DISSUSION	4
III. ARGUMENT	6
A. Waiver Supports Petitioner's Claim	7
B. Courts of Appeals Violated Const.	10
IV. REASON FOR GRATING REHEARING	11
V. CONCLUSION	13

PETITION FOR REHEARING

The Petitioner Napoleon Spear hereby files this Petition for Rehearing in this matter pursuant to the Supreme Court Rules, Rule 44(a) within (25) days from the date of this Court denying the petition for Certiorari in this matter. See, Rule 44.

I. BACKGROUND

This Court denied Certiorari on October 4th, 2010 without reason to the parties. Notwithstanding this fact, the Petitioner prays that this Court not simply overlook this Petition concerning the very important Federal question presented in this petition. On October 22nd, 2007, the Petitioner's civil trial started in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City for a straight four days and on the fifth day of said trial the Respondent General Motors Corporation's (herein referred as GMC), lawyers approached Petitioner's lawyer with a settlement with a full acknowledgment of full and total responsibility of all Petitioner's injuries. The Petitioner's lawyer and some of Petitioner family members tried to convince Petitioner to accept the GMC settlement. The Petitioner later agreed to the settlement with the understanding that Petitioner would be paid 100% of total disability by Respondent, GMC. The Circuit Court for Baltimore City later remanded the case back to the Maryland Worker Compensation Commission for a final determination of the settlement stated in the consent order by the parties. However, contrary to the consent order and the settlement understanding by the parties, the Maryland Worker Compensation Commission erred in its final determination. The Petitioner appealed on April 21st, 2008 again to Circuit Court for Baltimore City from the final determination of the Maryland Worker Compensation Commission. On May 19th, 2008, Respondent, GMC moved the Circuit Court for Baltimore City for dismissal of Petitioner's de nova appeal on the ground that the appeal was untimely. On August 1st, 2008 the Circuit Court dismissed Petitioner's de novo appeal on this ground along. See, Pet. App. at 2-10.

On September 3rd, 2008, Petitioner timely appealed the Circuit Court's dismissal to the Special Court of Appeals of Maryland, arguing that the Circuit Court erred in dismissing Petitioner's case as untimely, when in fact Petitioner's de novo appeal was timely. Respondent, GMC later filed its brief conceding that Petitioner was correct, but asked the Special Court of Appeals to affirm the Circuit Court for another reason to which the Petitioner had no due process notice of a final judgment which covers all issues in the case.[1]

On November 5th, 2009, the Special Court of Appeals of Maryland instead of reversing the Circuit Court for the error in dismissing Petitioner's de novo appeal before that Court, the Special Court of Appeals erroneously affirmed the Circuit Court for Baltimore City on a ground for what was stated in the transcript of the final hearing before the Circuit Court and not for what was actually rule upon by the Circuit Court in its order. See, Pet. App. at 2-12.

Due to the erroneous action by the Special Court of Appeals of Maryland in affirming the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, the Petitioner petition the Maryland Court of Appeals for certiorari. On March 3rd, 2010, the Maryland Court of Appeals denied Petitioner's petition for certiorari in that Court. See, Pet. App. at 2-10.

The questions presented in this petition, is not whether Petitioner received all that Petitioner is

---

[1] GMC filed its brief in the Special Court of Appeal asking it to affirm the Circuit Court for any reason.

legally entitled to receive, but whether the Special Court of Appeals of Maryland and the Maryland Court of Appeals both violated the Federal Constitution under 5th and 14th Amendments when they did not give the Petitioner the right to notice.

Finally, the Petitioner has now learned that on January 25th, 2009, Respondent improperly terminated the Petitioner. Due the Petitioner's Union of the Respondent, GMC, the Petitioner is now being reinstated as a disabled employee with GMC. Such wrongfully termination has caused Petitioner great hardship and pain to which Petitioner could no longer afford his pain medication. This Court should grant rehearing as a matter of justice in order to protect the rights of the Petitioner.

A. Damages to the Petitioner Caused By GMC

The Petitioner avers that he has been damaged from October 27th, 2009 to present as a direct result of the litigation tactics employed by the Respondent through litigation in this Court and the Courts of the State of Maryland. These damages are **$50,000,000.00** (Fifty Million Dollars). The Respondent has admitted to such damages due to its waiver filed with this Court and its default.

II. DISCUSSION

This Petition for Rehearing addresses one important Federal question that this Court should surly address. Pro se litigant should not be dined the opportunity to bring issues before this Court simply because this law Clerks recommends to this Court or fills that the issue raised by pro se parties are not important enough warrant this Court's consideration and time. Whatever process this Court use in order to screen petitions and applications in this Court, it should be done with the upmost caution and respect to pro se parties.

In *Betts* v. *Brady*, 316 U.S. 455, 62 S.Ct. 1252, 86 L.Ed. 1595 (1954), this Court asserted that the denial of due process is to be tested by an appraisal of the totality of facts given in a case. That which constitute a denial of fundamental fairness and shocking to the universal sense of justice may, in other circumstances and in the light of other considerations which fall short of such denial. See, 316 U.S., at 462, 62 S.Ct., at 1256, 86 L.Ed. 1595. Under both the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution, neither the federal government nor state governments may deprive any person *"of life, liberty, or property without due process of law."* Chief Justice William Howard Taft explained the purpose behind the clauses in *Truax* v. *Corrigan* 257 U.S. 317 (1921) as follows:

> "The due process clause requires that every man shall have the protection of his day in court, and the benefit of the general law, a law which hears before it condemns, which proceeds not arbitrarily or capriciously, but upon inquiry, and renders judgment only after trial, so that every citizen shall hold his

> life, liberty, property and immunities under the protection of the general rules which govern society. It, of course, tends to secure equality of law in the sense that it makes a required minimum of protection for every one's right of life, liberty, and property, which the Congress or the Legislature may not withhold."

In numerous decisions, this Court *"has held that the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment forbids the Federal Government to deny equal protection of the laws."* e.g., Hampton v. Mow Sun Wong, 426 U.S. 88, 100, 96 S.Ct. 1895, 1903, 48 L.Ed.2d 495 (1976); Buckley v. Valeo, 424 U.S. 1, 93, 96 S.Ct. 612, 670, 46 L.Ed.2d 659 (1976); Weinberger v. Wiesenfeld, 420 U.S. 636, 638 n. 2, 95 S.Ct. 1225, 1228, 43 L.Ed.2d 514 (1975); *Bolling* v. *Sharpe*, 347 U.S. 497, 500, 74 S.Ct. 693, 694, 98 L.Ed. 884 (1954). *Vance* v. *Bradley*, 440 U.S. 93, 95 n. 1, 99 S.Ct. 939, 942, 59 L.Ed.2d 171 (1979). *"To withstand scrutiny under the equal protection component of the Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause, 'classifications by gender must serve important governmental objectives and must be substantially related to achievement of those objectives."* See, Craig v. Boren, 429 U.S. 190, 197, 97 S.Ct. 451, 456, 50 L.Ed.2d 397 (1976); *Califano* v. *Webster*, 430 U.S. 313, 316-317, 97 S.Ct. 1192, 1194, 51 L.Ed.2d 360 (1977).[2]

[2] The State Appellate Courts of this country properly share the responsibility for protecting the constitutional rights of those of disable persons such as the Petitioner in this case.

VII. ARGUMENT

The Respondent has already conceded through its wavier to respond to Petitioner's petition for certiorari as it did in the State Courts before the Maryland Special Court of Appeals that the Circuit Court for Baltimore City erred when it dismissed Petitioner's de novo appeal from the Maryland Worker's Compensation Commission.

The Respondent's filed wavier with this Court should clearly support all facts and arguments stated in Petitioner's petition. The Petitioner hereby moves this Court to adopt the facts and arguments stated in the Petitioner's petition for certiorari as true and correct due to the Respondent's waiver.

August 1st, 2008, without due process notice to the Petitioner, the Circuit Court held a hearing and dismissed Petitioner's petition for judicial review. See, Pet. Appx. at 5. Instead of reversing the Circuit Court for dismissing the case as untimely, the Special Court of Appeals erroneously affirmed the Circuit Court for what the Circuit Court stated in the transcript and not for what was actually ruled upon by the Circuit Court in its final order.

The real issue in this petition is whether the Special Court of Appeals violated the Fifth and the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution when the Special Court of Appeals erroneously affirmed the Circuit Court for a reason stated in the transcript contrary to what the Circuit Court decided in its final order of dismissal of Petitioner's case. This was at the appellate stage.

The Petitioner raises these important due process concerns under the Fifth and the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. See, *Mapp* v. *Ohio*, 367 U.S. 643, 654-55 (1961).

The substantive element of the Due Process Clause protects certain rights not expressly mentioned in the Constitution, such as the right to prevent the State Courts from infringement upon the rights of the party to have a fair and final hearing. See *Planned Parenthood* v. *Casey*, 505 U.S. 833, 847-49, 112 S.Ct. 2791, 120 L.Ed.2d 674 (1992). In this case, the Special Court of Appeals affirmed the trial Court on a ground to which the Petitioner had no notice and this violates Petitioner's due process rights to notice. See, *Parratt* v. *Taylor*, 451 U.S. 527, 101 S.Ct. 1908, 68 L.Ed.2d 420 (1981).

A. *Wavier Supports Petitioner's Claims*

The Respondent, General Motors Company's wavier to respond to Petitioner's claims in his petition for certiorari should clearly indicate that this Court has jurisdiction to hear this matter and that the constitutional violations stated herein accrued at the appellate stage of these proceedings.

The Special Court of Appeals of Maryland clearly violated the 5th, and 14th, Amendments to the United States Constitution when it denied the Petitioner the right to due process notice in this matter. The Petitioner had no remedy other than to petition for certiorari in the Maryland Court of Appeals which is the highest Court of that State. See, 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a).

The Petitioner never received a final order as to all issues in the case. The Special Court of Appeals of Maryland affirmed the Circuit Court for what was stated in the transcript of the final hearing and not for what was actually ruled upon by the Circuit Court in the final order of that Court. This violates the Due Process Clauses of the Constitution of the United States because Special Court of Appeals' opinion denies Petitioner of his right to properly appeal all issue in the case. The Petitioner was never given the right at the appellate stage to address his constitutional claims in the highest Court of the State pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a).

The Petitioner could not appeal the issue that Special Court of Appeals rested its opinion on because Petitioner's appeal was limited to what the Circuit Court actually decided. Thus the Special Court of Appeals violated the Due Process Clauses of the Constitution of the United States because Special Court of Appeals opinion denies Petitioner of his right to properly appeal all issue in the case with notice. See, *Parratt* v. *Taylor*, 451 U.S. 527, 101 S.Ct. 1908, 68 L.Ed.2d 420 (1981). The Circuit Court for Baltimore City erroneously made the wrong final determination that Petitioner's petition was untimely, when in fact, it was timely. The Circuit Court dismissed the action on this ground along. Petitioner appealed from this dismissal.

The Special Court of Appeals found and the Respondent conceded that Petitioner appeal was timely. However, instead of reversing the Circuit Court, the Special Court of Appeals affirmed the trial Court on the ground for what was stated by the Circuit Court in the transcript and not for what the Circuit Court actually ruled on.

This is contrary to the Federal Constitution, because Petitioner was denied his right to notice of a final order which covers all issues in the case so that he could appeal all issues in the final order. See, *Logan v. Zimmerman Brush Co.*, 455 U.S. 422, 435-436, 102 S.Ct. 1148, 1157-1158, 71 L.Ed.2d 265 (1982).

B. *Courts of Appeals Violated Constitution*

Secondly, the Special Court of Appeals erred when it affirmed the Circuit Court for Baltimore City on the ground for what was stated in the transcript rather then what was rule upon by the Circuit Court in its final order thereby violating the 5th, and 14th, Amendments to the United States Constitution. The Court of Appeals cited this Court holding in *Waller v. Maryland Nat'l Bank*, 332 Md. 375 at 379 (1993) stating that *("when there is a conflict between the transcript of a trial and the docket entries, the transcript, unless shown to be in error, will prevail")*

The Maryland Court Appeals in *Waller* has never held that a transcript control over a final order of a trial Court. Thus the Special Court of Appeals has clearly misconstrued the holding in *Waller* in order to base its decision in Petitioner's appeals.

This Court has held in *Memphis Light, Gas & Water Div. v. Craft*, 436 U.S. 1, 13 (1978) that:

> "An elementary and fundamental requirement of due process in any proceeding which is to be accorded finality is notice reasonably calculated, under all the circumstances to apprise interested parties of

the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections."

First, Respondent fails to address the issues presented in Petitioner's petition for certiorari. See, Pet. Cert. at p. (ii) (Questions Presented). Failure to address a properly file and timely petition means that the petition is unopposed as to the issues presented therein. Secondly, in Respondent answer to the petition for certiorari, Respondent shows that Petitioner did not receive total disability for all of his claims as agreed by the parties.

Therefore, it was clear that the Special Court of Appeals violated Petitioner's right to due process under the State and Federal Constitutions. See, *Logan* v. *Zimmerman Brush Co.*, 455 U.S. 422, 435-436, 102 S.Ct. 1148, 1157-1158, 71 L.Ed.2d 265 (1982) (post-deprivation remedies do not satisfy due process where deprivation is caused by established state procedures). This Supreme Court has interpreted those two clauses identically, as Justice Felix Frankfurter once explained in a concurring opinion: *"To suppose that due process of law"* meant one thing in the Fifth Amendment and another in the Fourteenth is too frivolous to require elaborate rejection. See, *Malinski v. New York*, 324 U.S. 401, 415 (1945), (Frankfurter, J., concurring).

VI. REASON FOR GRANTING REHEARING

This case presents this Court with a clear opportunity to address a due process concern that is exceedingly important and unprecedented. This question is of first impression, concerning constitutional law under both the 5th and 14th Amendments to United States Constitution. The question should be fully resolved by this Court and should be settled by this Court concerning the application of the 5th and 14th Amendments to the United States Constitution in the State Courts.

The Fourteenth Amendment prohibits the deprivation of liberty or property without due process of law. A due process claim is cognizable only if there is a recognized liberty or property interest at stake. See, *Board of Regents* v. *Roth*, 408 U.S. 564, 69 (1972). If the State Court acts repugnant to the Constitution, treaties, or laws of the United States, or where any title, right, privilege, or immunity is specially set up or claimed under the Constitution or any treaty or statute in the State Court, and the State's highest Court has denied relief, Federal Law, 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a) authorized this Court to hear petitions for writ of certiorari. The reason for granting this Petition for Rehearing in this matter is because the Maryland Court of Appeals violated the due process provisions of the United States Constitution under both the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments when it refused to address Petitioner's due process claims to the Special Court of Appeals of Maryland. See, Bouie v. City of Columbia, 378 U.S. 347, 353-354, 84 S. Ct. 1697, 12 L. Ed. 2d 894 (1964)

Due process is best defined in one word--fairness. Throughout the United States' history, its Constitution, Statutes and Case Law have all provided standards for fair treatment of citizens by federal, state and local governments. These standards are known as due process. When a person is treated unfairly by the government, including the State Courts, it is said to have deprived a person of due process of law. This case clearly fits within this Court's right to exercise jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a) because the Maryland Court of Appeals denied certiorari to hear a Federal constitutional claim against the Special Court of Appeals of Maryland denying the Petitioner of due process of law when it erroneously affirmed the lower Circuit Court for Baltimore City on a ground to which Petitioner had no notice.

VI. CONCLUSION

The Petitioner has suffered through the proceedings in the State court system. This Court has the opportunity to address some important issue presented in Petitioner's petition. Petitioner is a disable person fighting for his rights to justice and this Court can remedy such in-justice done to the Petitioner in this matter. The Petitioner request that his petition for rehearing be GRANTED.

WHEREFORE, The Petitioner, Napoleon Spear hereby moves this Court to GRANT this Petition for Rehearing because of the gave denial of due process of law by both the Maryland Court of Appeals, the Special Court of Appeals of Maryland and the Circuit Court for Baltimore City. Petitioner is entitled to such relief as a matter of law.

This 26th, day of October 2010

Respectfully Submitted,

Napoleon Spear

NAPOLEON SPEAR, Petitioner
1419 Kennesaw Drive, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30318
(404) 875-4877

Counsel for Petitioner